

### **REMARKS**

In the Final Office Action mailed on September 24, 2007, the Examiner objected to the form of the Abstract and rejected 6, 9, 10, and 11 under one of 35 U.S.C. § 102 or 103. In addition, the Examiner stated that claims 7 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims.<sup>1</sup>

In the present Amendment and Response, Applicants amended independent claim 6 to include all of the limitations of claim 7. Claim 7 was cancelled and claim 8 and was amended to depend from claim 6. Applicants also amended the Abstract to address matters of form. In view of the present amendments, Applicants request that all objections and rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### ***In the Abstract***

Applicants amended the Abstract to address matters of language and format. Specifically, phrases such as “The invention relates to” and “said” have been removed. In addition, reference numbers have been deleted. Applicants respectfully submit that the Abstract is now in narrative form and is within a range of 50 to 150 words. A clean, non-marked up copy of the Abstract appears on a separate page attached to this Amendment and Response and is limited to a single paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

#### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102***

Claims 6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Japanese Patent JP8061329 to Noriyuki (“Noriyuki”).

Applicants respectfully submit that currently amended claim 6 is allowable because it includes all of the limitations from allowable claim 7. Applicants also respectfully submit that claim 10 is allowable because it depends upon allowable claim 6.

---

<sup>1</sup> Page 4 of the Final Office Action states that claims 7 and 8 would be allowable if “rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.” As there were no 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejections contained in the Final Office Action, Applicants believe that this is a typographical error and that claims 7 and 8 will be allowable upon rewriting them in independent form.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103***

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Noriyuki.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Noriyuki in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,694,547 to Broussard.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11 and 9 are allowable because they depend upon allowable claim 6.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and request early favorable action. If the Examiner believes a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is welcome to contact Applicants' Agent at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 18, 2008

/s/Isaac A. Hubner, Reg. No. 61,393/

Isaac A. Hubner, Reg. No. 61,393

Agent for the Applicants

Proskauer Rose LLP

One International Place

Boston, MA 02110

Tel. No.: (617) 526-9893

Fax No.: (617) 526-9899